arXiv:0912.2591v1 [math.LO] 14 Dec 2009

A model theoretic Baire category theorem for simple theories

Ziv Shami

December 14, 2009

Abstract

We prove a model theoretic Baire category theorem for $\tilde{\tau}^f_{low}$-sets in a countable simple theory in which the extension property is first-order and show some of its applications.

1 Introduction

The goal of this paper is to generalize a result from [S1] and to give some applications. In [S1] The first step for proving supersimplicity of countable unidimensional simple theories that eliminates hyperimaginaries is to show the existence of an unbounded type-definable τ^f-open set of bounded finite SU_{se}-rank (for definition see section 4). In this paper we develop a general framework for this kind of result. The proof is similar to the proof in [S1], however it has some important consequences, e.g. in a countable wnfcp theory if for every non-algebraic element a (even in some fixed $\tilde{\tau}^f_{low}$-set) there is $a' \in acl(a)\backslash acl(\emptyset)$ of finite SU-rank, then there exists a weakly-minimal formula. As far as we know, this is new even in the stable case (i.e. when T is a countable nfcp theory).

2 Preliminaries

The forking topology is introduced in [S0] and is a variant of Hrushovski's and Pillay's topologies from [H0] and [P] respectively:

Definition 2.1 Let $A \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ and let x be a finite tuple of variables.
1) An invariant set $\mathcal{U}$ over A is said to be *a basic τ^f-open set over A* if there is $\phi(x,y) \in L(A)$ such that

$$\mathcal{U} = \{a | \phi(a,y) \text{ forks over } A\}.$$

2) An invariant set $\mathcal{U}$ over A is said to be *a basic τ^f_∞-open set over A* if $\mathcal{U}$ is a type-definable τ^f-open set over A.

Note that the family of basic τ^f-open sets over A is closed under finite intersections, thus form a basis for a unique topology on $S_x(A)$. Likewise, we define the τ^f_∞-topologies.

Recall, the following definition from [S0] whose roots are in [H0].

Definition 2.2 We say that *the τ^f-topologies over A are closed under projections (T is PCFT over A)* if for every τ^f-open set $\mathcal{U}(x,y)$ over A the set $\exists y \mathcal{U}(x,y)$ is a τ^f-open set over A. We say that *the τ^f-topologies are closed under projections (T is PCFT)* if they are over every set A.

Recall that a formula $\phi(x,y) \in L$ is *low in x* if there exists $k < \omega$ such that for every $\emptyset$-indiscernible sequence $(b_i | i < \omega)$, the set $\{\phi(x,b_i) | i < \omega\}$ is inconsistent iff every subset of it of size k is inconsistent. T is low if every $\phi(x,y)$ is low in x.

Remark 2.3 *Assume $\phi(x,t) \in L$ is low in t and $\psi(y,v) \in L$ is low in v ($x \cap y$ or $t \cap v$ may not be $\emptyset$). Then $\theta(xy,tv) \equiv \phi(x,t) \vee \psi(y,v)$ is low in tv.*

Proof: Let $k_1 < \omega$ be a witness that $\phi(x,t)$ is low in t and let $k_2 < \omega$ be a witness that $\psi(y,v)$ is low in v. Let $k = k_1 + k_2 - 1$. By adding dummy variables we may assume $x = y$ and $t = v$ (as tuples of variables). Let $(a_i |\ i < \omega)$ be indiscernible such that $\{\phi(a_i,t) \vee \psi(a_i,t) | i < \omega\}$ is inconsistent. Thus, every subset of $\{\phi(a_i,t) | i < \omega\}$ of size k_1 is inconsistent, and every subset of $\{\psi(a_i,t) | i < \omega\}$ of size k_2 is inconsistent. Thus every subset of size k of $\{\phi(a_i,t) \vee \psi(a_i,t) | i < \omega\}$ is inconsistent.

In [BPV, Proposition 4.5] the authors proved the following equivalence which, for convenience, we will use as a definition (their definition involves extension with respect to pairs of models of T).

Definition 2.4 *The extension property is first-order in T iff for every formulas $\phi(x,y), \psi(y,z) \in L$ the relation $Q_{\phi,\psi}$ defined by:*

$$Q_{\phi,\psi}(a) \text{ iff } \phi(x,b) \text{ doesn't fork over } a \text{ for every } b \models \psi(y,a)$$

is type-definable (here a can be an infinite tuple from $\mathcal{C}$ whose sorts are fixed). We say that T has wnfcp if T is low and the extension property is first-order in T.

Fact 2.5 [*S*1] *Suppose the extension property is first-order in T. Then T is PCFT.*

We say that an A-invariant set $\mathcal{U}$ has finite SU-rank if $SU(a/A) < \omega$ for all $a \in \mathcal{U}$, and has bounded finite SU-rank if there exists $n < \omega$ such that $SU(a/A) \leq n$ for all $a \in \mathcal{U}$. The existence of a τ^f-open set of bounded finite SU-rank implies the existence of a weakly-minimal formula:

Fact 2.6 *[S0, Proposition 2.13] Let $\mathcal{U}$ be an unbounded τ^f-open set over some set A. Assume $\mathcal{U}$ has bounded finite SU-rank. Then there exists a set $B \supseteq A$ and $\theta(x) \in L(B)$ of SU-rank 1 such that $\theta^{\mathcal{C}} \subseteq \mathcal{U} \cup acl(B)$.*

In [S1] the class of $\tilde{\tau}^f$-sets is introduced, this class is much wider than the class of basic τ^f-open sets. Here, we look at the class of $\tilde{\tau}^f_{low}$-sets, instead of the class of $\tilde{\tau}^f_{st}$-sets from [S1].

Definition 2.7 A relation $V(x, z_1, ...z_l)$ is said to be a *pre-$\tilde{\tau}^f$-set relation* if there are $\theta(\tilde{x}, x, z_1, z_2, ..., z_l) \in L$ and $\phi_i(\tilde{x}, y_i) \in L$ for $0 \leq i \leq l$ such that for all $a, d_1, ..., d_l \in \mathcal{C}$ we have

$$V(a, d_1, ..., d_l) \text{ iff } \exists \tilde{a} \ [\theta(\tilde{a}, a, d_1, d_2, ..., d_l) \wedge \bigwedge_{i=0}^{l} (\phi_i(\tilde{a}, y_i) \text{ forks over } d_1 d_2 ... d_i)]$$

(for $i = 0$ the sequence $d_1 d_2 ... d_i$ is interpreted as $\emptyset$). If each $\phi_i(\tilde{x}, y_i)$ is assumed to be low in y_i , $V(x, z_1, ...z_l)$ is said to be a *pre-$\tilde{\tau}^f_{low}$-set relation.*

Definition 2.8 1) A *$\tilde{\tau}^f$-set (over $\emptyset$)* is a set of the form

$$\mathcal{U} = \{a | \ \exists d_1, d_2, ...d_l \ V(a, d_1, ..., d_l)\}$$

for some *pre-$\tilde{\tau}^f$-set relation* $V(x, z_1, ...z_l)$.
2) A *$\tilde{\tau}^f_{low}$-set (over $\emptyset$)* is a set of the form

$$\mathcal{U} = \{a | \ \exists d_1, d_2, ...d_l \ V(a, d_1, ..., d_l)\}$$

for some *pre-$\tilde{\tau}^f_{low}$-set relation* $V(x, z_1, ...z_l)$.

3 The Theorem

In this section T is assumed to be a simple theory and we work in $\mathcal{C}$ (so, T not necessarily eliminates imaginaries).

Definition 3.1 Let $\Theta = \{\theta_i(x_i, x)\}_{i\in I}$ be a set of L-formulas such that $\exists^{<\infty} x_i\theta_i(x_i, x)$ for all $i \in I$. Let s be the sort of x. For $A \subseteq \mathcal{C}^s$, let $acl_\Theta(A) = \{b|\ \theta_i(b, a)$ for some $\theta_i \in \Theta$ and $a \in A\}$.

Definition 3.2 An invariant set $\mathcal{U}(x, y_1, ...y_r)$ is said to be *a generalized uniform family of* $\tilde{\tau}^f_{low}$*-sets* if there is a formula $\rho(\tilde{x}, x, y_1, ..., y_r, z_1, z_2, ..., z_k) \in L$ and there are formulas $\psi_i(\tilde{x}, v_i), \mu_j(\tilde{x}, w_j) \in L$ for $0 \leq i \leq r$ and $1 \leq j \leq k$ that are low in v_i and low in w_j respectively, such that for all $a, d_1, ...d_r$ we have $\mathcal{U}(a, d_1, ...d_r)$ iff $\exists\tilde{a}\exists e_1...e_k$

$$\rho(\tilde{a}, a, d_1, ...d_r, e_1, ...e_k)\wedge[\bigwedge_{i=0}^{r} \psi_i(\tilde{a}, v_i) \text{ forks over } d_1...d_i]\wedge[\bigwedge_{j=1}^{k} \mu_j(\tilde{a}, w_j) \text{ forks over } d_1...d_r e_1...e_j].$$

Definition 3.3 An invariant set $\mathcal{F}(x, y_1, ...y_r)$ is said to be *a uniform family of* $\tilde{\tau}^f_{low}$*-closed sets if* $\mathcal{F}(x, y_1, ...y_r) = \bigcap_i \neg\mathcal{U}_i(x, y_1, ...y_r)$*, where each* $\mathcal{U}_i(x, y_1, ...y_r)$ *is a uniform family of* $\tilde{\tau}^f_{low}$*-sets.*

Fact 3.4 *Assume the extension property is first-order in* T*. Then*
1) Let $\mathcal{U}$ *be an unbounded* $\tilde{\tau}^f$*-set over* $\emptyset$*. Then there exists an unbounded* τ^f*-open set* $\mathcal{U}^*$ *over some finite set* A^* *such that* $\mathcal{U}^* \subseteq \mathcal{U}$*. In fact, if* $V(x, z_1, ..., z_l)$ *is a pre-*$\tilde{\tau}^f$*-set relation such that* $\mathcal{U} = \{a|\exists d_1...d_l V(a, d_1, ..., d_l)\}$*, and* $(d^*_1, ..., d^*_m)$ *is any maximal sequence (with respect to extension) such that* $\exists d_{m+1}...d_l V(\mathcal{C}, d^*_1, ..., d^*_m, d_{m+1}, ..., d_l)$ *is unbounded, then*

$$\mathcal{U}^* = \exists d_{m+1}...d_l V(\mathcal{C}, d^*_1, ..., d^*_m, d_{m+1}, ..., d_l)$$

is a τ^f*-open set over* $d^*_1...d^*_m$*.*

Theorem 3.5 *Let* T *be a countable simple theory in which the extension property is first-order. Assume:*
1) $\Theta = \{\theta_i(x'_i, x)\}_{i<\omega}$ *is a set of* L*-formulas such that* $\exists^{<\infty} x'_i\theta_i(x'_i, x)$ *for all* $i < \omega$*.*
2) $\mathcal{U}_0(x)$ *is a non-empty* $\tilde{\tau}^f_{low}$*-set over* $\emptyset$*.*

3) $\{F_n(x_n)\}_{n<\omega}$ *is a family of* $\emptyset$*-invariant sets such that* $F_n(\mathcal{C}) \cap acl(\emptyset) = \emptyset$ *for all* $n < \omega$*.*
4) For every $n < \omega$ *and every variables* $\bar{y} = y_1, ...y_r$*, let* $\mathcal{F}_n^{\bar{y}}(x_n, \bar{y})$ *be a generalized uniform family of* $\tilde{\tau}^f_{low}$*-closed sets such that* $F_n(\mathcal{C}) \subseteq \mathcal{F}_n^{\bar{y}}(\mathcal{C}, \bar{d})$ *for all* $\bar{d}$*.*
Now, assume for all $a \in \mathcal{U}_0$ *there exists* $b \in acl_\Theta(a)$ *and* $n < \omega$ *such that* $b \in F_n(\mathcal{C})$*. Then there is an unbounded* τ^f_∞*-open set* $\mathcal{U}^*$ *over a finite tuple* $\bar{d}^*$ *and variables* $\bar{y}^*$ *of the sort of* $\bar{d}^*$*, and* $n^* < \omega$ *such that*

$$\mathcal{U}^* \subseteq \mathcal{F}_{n^*}^{\bar{y}^*}(\mathcal{C}, \bar{d}^*) \cap acl_\Theta(\mathcal{U}_0).$$

Proof: First, we may assume Θ is closed downwards (i.e. if $\theta \in \Theta$ and $\theta' \vdash \theta$ then $\theta' \in \Theta$). Assume the conclusion of the theorem is false. It will be sufficient to show that for every non-empty $\tilde{\tau}^f_{low}$-set $\mathcal{U} \subseteq \mathcal{U}_0$, every $\theta \in \Theta$, and every $n < \omega$ there exists a non-empty $\tilde{\tau}^f_{low}$-set $\mathcal{U}^* \subseteq \mathcal{U}$ such that either $\neg\exists x'\theta(x', a)$ for all $a \in \mathcal{U}^*$ or for all $a \in \mathcal{U}^*$ there exists $b \models \theta(x', a)$ with $b \notin F_n(\mathcal{C})$. Indeed, by iterating this for every pair $(\theta, n) \in \Theta \times \omega$ we get by compactness a^* such that for all $\theta \in \Theta$ and all $n < \omega$ either $\neg\exists x'\theta(x', a^*)$ or there exists $b_{n,\theta} \models \theta(x', a^*)$ such that $b_{n,\theta} \notin F_n(\mathcal{C})$. Since we assume Θ is closed downwards, we get contradiction to the assumption that for all $a \in \mathcal{U}_0$ there exists $b \in acl_\Theta(a)$ and $n < \omega$ such that $b \in F_n(\mathcal{C})$ (note that $F_n(\mathcal{C})$ is $\emptyset$-invariant). To show this, let $\mathcal{U}$, θ and $n < \omega$ be given. Let $V(x, z_1, ...z_l)$ be a pre-$\tilde{\tau}^f_{low}$-set relation such that

$$\mathcal{U} = \{a |\ \exists d_1, d_2, ...d_l\ V(a, d_1, ..., d_l)\}.$$

where V is defined by:

$$V(a, d_1, ..., d_l) \text{ iff } \exists \tilde{a}\ [\sigma(\tilde{a}, a, d_1, d_2, ..., d_l) \wedge \bigwedge_{i=0}^{l} (\phi_i(\tilde{a}, t_i) \text{ forks over } d_1 d_2 ... d_i)]$$

for some $\sigma(\tilde{x}, x, z_1, z_2, ..., z_l) \in L$ and $\phi_i(\tilde{x}, t_i) \in L$ which are low in t_i for $0 \leq i \leq l$. Let V_θ be defined by: for all $b, d_1, ..., d_l \in \mathcal{C}$,

$$V_\theta(b, d_1, ..., d_l) \text{ iff } \exists a(\theta(b, a) \wedge V(a, d_1, ..., d_l)).$$

and let

$$\mathcal{U}_\theta = \{b |\ \exists d_1, d_2, ...d_l\ V_\theta(b, d_1, ..., d_l)\}.$$

Since by the assumption $F_n(\mathcal{C}) \cap acl(\emptyset) = \emptyset$, we may assume $\mathcal{U}_\theta \cap acl(\emptyset) = \emptyset$ and $\mathcal{U}_\theta$ is non-empty. Now, let $\bar{d}^* = (d_1^*, ..., d_m^*)$ be a maximal sequence, with respect to extension $(0 \leq m \leq l)$ such that

$$\tilde{V}_\theta(x') \equiv \exists d_{m+1}, d_{m+2}, ...d_l V_\theta(x', d_1^*, ...d_m^*, d_{m+1}, ...d_l)$$

is non-algebraic. We may assume $m < l$ (by choosing V appropriately). By Fact 3.4, $\tilde{V}_\theta(\mathcal{C})$ is an unbounded basic τ_∞^f-open set over $\bar{d}^*$. Since we assume the conclusion of the theorem is false, $\tilde{V}_\theta(\mathcal{C}) \not\subseteq \mathcal{F}_n^{\bar{y}^*}(\mathcal{C}, \bar{d}^*)$ where $\bar{y}^* = y_1^*, ..., y_m^*$ has the same sort as $\bar{d}^*$. Now, let $\mathcal{U}_{s,n}(x_n, \bar{y}^*)$ for $s < \omega$ be each a uniform family of $\tilde{\tau}_{low}^f$-sets such that $\mathcal{F}_n(x_n, \bar{y}^*) = \bigcap_s \neg\mathcal{U}_{s,n}(x_n, \bar{y}^*)$. Let $b^* \in \tilde{V}_\theta(\mathcal{C}) \backslash \mathcal{F}_n^{\bar{y}^*}(\mathcal{C}, \bar{d}^*)$. So, there exists $s^* < \omega$ such that $b^* \in \mathcal{U}_{s^*,n}(\mathcal{C}, \bar{d}^*)$. Let $\rho(\tilde{x}', x_n, y_1^*, ..., y_m^*, z_1', z_2', ..., z_k') \in L$ and let $\psi_i(\tilde{x}', v_i), \mu_j(\tilde{x}', w_j) \in L$ for $0 \leq i \leq m$ and $1 \leq j \leq k$ be low in v_i and low in w_j respectively, such that for all $b, d_1, ...d_m$ we have $\mathcal{U}_{s^*,n}(b, d_1, ...d_m)$ iff $\exists \tilde{b} \exists e_1...e_k$

$$\rho(\tilde{b}, b, d_1, ...d_m, e_1, ...e_k) \wedge [\bigwedge_{i=0}^{m} \psi_i(\tilde{b}, v_i) \text{ forks over } d_1...d_i] \wedge [\bigwedge_{j=1}^{k} \mu_j(\tilde{b}, w_j) \text{ forks over } d_1...d_m e_1...e_j].$$

Now, let $d_{m+1}^*, ...d_l^*$ and $a^*, \tilde{a}^*$ and $E^* = (e_1^*, ..., e_k^*)$ and $\tilde{b}^*$ be such that

$$\theta(b^*, a^*) \wedge \sigma(\tilde{a}^*, a^*, d_1^*, d_2^*, ..., d_l^*) \wedge \bigwedge_{i=0}^{l} (\phi_i(\tilde{a}^*, y_i) \text{ forks over } d_1^* d_2^* ... d_i^*) \quad (*1)$$

and

$$\rho(\tilde{b}^*, b^*, d_1^*, ..d_m^*, e_1^*, ..e_k^*) \ (*2)$$

and

$$[\bigwedge_{i=0}^{m} \psi_i(\tilde{b}^*, v_i) \text{ forks over } d_1^*...d_i^*] \wedge [\bigwedge_{j=1}^{k} \mu_j(\tilde{b}^*, w_j) \text{ forks over } d_1^*...d_m^* e_1^*...e_j^*] \ (*3).$$

By maximality of $\bar{d}^*$, we know $b^* \in acl(\bar{d}^* d_{m+1}^*)$. Thus, by taking a non-forking extension of $tp(\tilde{b}^* E^* / acl(\bar{d}^* d_{m+1}^*))$ over $acl(d_1^*...d_l^* a^* \tilde{a}^*)$ we may assume E^* is independent from $d_1^*...d_l^* a^* \tilde{a}^*$ over $\bar{d}^* d_{m+1}^*$ and $(*1)$, $(*2)$ and $(*3)$ still hold. We conclude that

$$\bigwedge_{i=m+1}^{l} (\phi_i(\tilde{a}^*, t_i) \text{ forks over } d_1^* d_2^* ... d_i^* E^*).$$

Now, we define the $\tilde{\tau}^f_{low}$-set $\mathcal{U}^*$. First, define a relation V^* by:

$$V^*(a, d_1, ...d_m, e_1, ...e_k, d_{m+1}, ..d_l) \text{ iff } \exists \tilde{a}, b, \tilde{b}(\theta^* \wedge V_0^* \wedge V_1^* \wedge V_2^*),$$

where θ^* is defined by: $\theta^*(\tilde{a}, b, \tilde{b}, a, d_1, ..d_m, e_1, ...e_k, d_{m+1}, ..d_l)$ iff

$$\theta(b, a) \wedge \sigma(\tilde{a}, a, d_1, d_2, ..., d_l) \wedge \rho(\tilde{b}, b, d_1, ...d_m, e_1, ..., e_k),$$

V_0^* is defined by: $V_0^*(\tilde{a}, \tilde{b}, d_1, ...d_m)$ iff

$$\bigwedge_{i=0}^{m} (\phi_i(\tilde{a}, t_i) \vee \psi_i(\tilde{b}, v_i) \text{ forks over } d_1 d_2 ... d_i),$$

V_1^* is defined by $V_1(\tilde{b}, d_1, ..d_m, e_1, ...e_k)$ iff

$$\bigwedge_{j=1}^{k} (\mu_j(\tilde{b}, w_j) \text{ forks over } d_1 ... d_m e_1 ... e_j), \text{ and}$$

V_2^* is defined by $V_2(\tilde{a}, d_1, ...d_m, e_1, ...e_k, d_{m+1}, ..d_l)$ iff

$$\bigwedge_{i=m+1}^{l} (\phi_i(\tilde{a}, t_i) \text{ forks over } d_1 d_2 ... d_i e_1 ... e_k).$$

Note that V^* is a pre-$\tilde{\tau}^f_{low}$-set. Let

$$\mathcal{U}^* = \{a | \exists d_1, ..d_m, e_1, ...e_k, d_{m+1}, ..d_l \ V^*(a, d_1, ..d_m, e_1, ...e_k, d_{m+1}, ...d_l)\}.$$

By the definition of $\mathcal{U}^*$, $\mathcal{U}^* \subseteq \mathcal{U}$. $\mathcal{U}^*$ is a $\tilde{\tau}^f_{low}$-set using Remark 2.3. By the construction, $\mathcal{U}^* \neq \emptyset$. Now, let $a \in \mathcal{U}^*$. By the definition of $\mathcal{U}^*$, there are $\tilde{b}, b, d_1, ...d_m, e_1, ...e_k$ such that $\theta(b, a)$, $\rho(\tilde{b}, b, d_1, ...d_m, e_1, ..., e_k)$,

$$\bigwedge_{i=0}^{m} (\psi_i(\tilde{b}, v_i) \text{ forks over } d_1, ...d_i) \text{ and } \bigwedge_{j=1}^{k} (\mu_j(\tilde{b}, w_j) \text{ forks over } d_1, ...d_m e_1 ... e_j).$$

Thus $\mathcal{U}_{s^*,n}(b, d_1 ... d_m)$ and therefore $\neg \mathcal{F}_n^{\bar{y}^*}(b, d_1 ... d_m)$. Hence $b \notin F_n$ as required.

4 Applications

In this section we show some applications of Theorem 3.5. In fact, we will show several instances of this theorem that apparently new even for stable theories. In this section T is assumed to be a simple theory and we work in $\mathcal{C}$.

We start by pointing out that theorem 3.5 generalizes [S1, Theorem 9.4] that is one of the essential steps towards the proof of supersimplicity of countable simple unidimensional theories with elimination of hyperimaginaries. First recall the following definitions from [S1].

Definition 4.1 *For $a \in \mathcal{C}$, $A \subseteq B \subseteq \mathcal{C}$, $a \underset{A}{\not\perp\!\!\!\perp^{s}} B$ if for some stable $\phi(x,y) \in L$, there is b over B and $a' \models \phi(x,b)$ for some $a' \in dcl(Aa)$ such that $\phi(x,b)$ forks over A.*

Definition 4.2 *The SU_{se}-rank of $tp(a/A)$ is defined by induction on α: if $\alpha = \beta + 1$, $SU_{se}(a/A) \geq \alpha$ if there exist $B_1 \supseteq B_0 \supseteq A$ such that $a \underset{B_0}{\not\perp\!\!\!\perp^{s}} B_1$ and $SU_{se}(a/B_1) \geq \beta$. For limit α, $SU_{se}(a/A) \geq \alpha$ if $SU_{se}(a/A) \geq \beta$ for all $\beta < \alpha$.*

Remark 4.3 First, recall that in a simple theory in which $Lstp = stp$ over sets $\perp\!\!\!\perp^{s}$ is symmetric [Lemma 6,7, S1]. Thus for any finite tuples of sorts s_0 and s_1 and $n < \omega$ the set $\mathcal{F}_n^{s_0,s_1}$ defined by

$$\mathcal{F}_n^{s_0,s_1} = \{(a,A) \in \mathcal{C}^{s_0} \times \mathcal{C}^{s_1} \mid SU_{se}(a/A) < n\}.$$

is a uniform family of $\tilde{\tau}^f_{low}$-closed sets.

For an A-invariant set V, let $acl_1(V) = \{a' \mid a' \in acl(a) \text{ for some } a \in V\}$. The following corollary generalizes [S1, Theorem 9.4].

Corollary 4.4 *Let T be a countable simple theory in which the extension property is first-order and assume $Lstp = stp$ over sets. Let $\mathcal{U}_0$ be a non-empty $\tilde{\tau}^f_{low}$-set. Assume for every $a \in \mathcal{U}_0$ there exists $a' \in acl(a) \backslash acl(\emptyset)$ such that $SU_{se}(a') < \omega$. Then there exists an unbounded τ^f_∞-open set $\mathcal{U} \subseteq acl_1(\mathcal{U}_0)$ over a finite set such that $\mathcal{U}$ has bounded finite SU_{se}-rank.*

Proof: Let x be the variable of $\mathcal{U}_0$, so $\mathcal{U}_0 = \mathcal{U}_0(x)$. Let

$$\Theta = \{\theta(x', x) | \ \exists^{<\infty} x' \theta(x', x), x' \text{ any variable}\}.$$

Let $\mathcal{S}$ be the set of sorts. Let $I : \omega \to \mathcal{S} \times \omega$ be a bijection, I_1, I_2 the projections of I to the first and second coordinate respectively. Now, for each $n < \omega$ let $F_n = \{a \in \mathcal{C}^{I_1(n)} \backslash acl(\emptyset) \ |SU_{se}(a) < I_2(n)\}$. Now, for every finite tuple of variables Y and $n < \omega$ let $s(Y)$ be the finite sequence of sorts of Y and let

$$\mathcal{F}^Y_n = \{(a, A) \in \mathcal{C}^{I_1(n)} \times \mathcal{C}^{s(Y)} | \ SU_{se}(a/A) < I_2(n)\}.$$

Now, by the definition of the SU_{se}-rank, $\mathcal{F}_n(\mathcal{C}) \subseteq \mathcal{F}^Y_n(\mathcal{C}, A)$ for every $n < \omega$ and every Y, A. By Remark 4.3, $\mathcal{F}^Y_n$ is a uniform family of $\tilde{\tau}^f_{low}$-closed sets for all Y, n. By our assumptions, we see that the assumptions of Theorem 3.5 hold for $\mathcal{U}_0(x)$, Θ ,$\{F_n\}_n$ and $\{\mathcal{F}^Y_n\}_{Y,n}$ and thus by its corollary we are done.

Corollary 4.5 *Let T be a countable theory with wnfcp. Let $\mathcal{U}_0$ be a non-empty $\tilde{\tau}^f_{low}$-set over $\emptyset$ of finite SU-rank. Then there exists a finite set A and a SU-rank 1 formula $\theta \in L(A)$ such that $\theta^{\mathcal{C}} \subseteq \mathcal{U}_0 \cup acl(A)$.*

Proof: Let $\Theta = \{x' = x\}$, $\mathcal{U}_0(x) = \mathcal{U}_0$ and let $\mathcal{S}, I, I_1, I_2$ be as in the proof of Corollary 4.4. Now, for each $n < \omega$ let

$$F_n = \{a \in \mathcal{C}^{I_1(n)} \backslash acl(\emptyset) \ |SU(a) < I_2(n)\}.$$

For every finite tuple of variables Y and $n < \omega$ let $s(Y)$ be the finite sequence of sorts of Y and let

$$\mathcal{F}^Y_n = \{(a, A) \in \mathcal{C}^{I_1(n)} \times \mathcal{C}^{s(Y)} | \ SU(a/A) < I_2(n)\}.$$

By symmetry of forking and the assumption that T is low, each $\mathcal{F}^Y_n$ is a uniform family of $\tilde{\tau}^f_{low}$-closed sets. Clearly, $F_n(\mathcal{C}) \subseteq \mathcal{F}^Y_n(\mathcal{C}, A)$ for every $n < \omega$ and every Y, A. By our assumption, the assumptions of Theorem 3.5 are satisfied for $\mathcal{U}_0$, Θ, $\{F_n\}_n$ and $\{\mathcal{F}^Y_n\}_{Y,n}$ and thus by its corollary there exists an unbounded τ^f-open set $\mathcal{U}^* \subseteq \mathcal{U}_0$ over a finite set A_0 and $\mathcal{U}^*$ has bounded finite SU-rank. By Fact 2.6, there exists a finite set $A \supseteq A_0$ and there exists a SU-rank 1 formula $\theta \in L(A)$ such that $\theta^{\mathcal{C}} \subseteq \mathcal{U}^* \cup acl(A)$.

Corollary 4.6 *Let T be a countable theory with wnfcp. Let $\mathcal{U}_0$ be a non-empty $\tilde{\tau}^f_{low}$-set over $\emptyset$. Assume for every $a \in \mathcal{U}_0$ there exists $a' \in acl(a) \backslash acl(\emptyset)$ such that $SU(a') < \omega$. Then there exists a finite set A and a SU-rank 1 formula $\theta \in L(A)$ such that $\theta^{\mathcal{C}} \subseteq acl_1(\mathcal{U}_0) \cup acl(A)$.*

Proof: Just like the proof of Corollary 4.5.

The above corollaries together with the dichotomy [S1, Theorem 5.5] implies a strong dichotomy between 1-basedness and supersimplicity in the case T is a countable wnfcp theory that eliminates hyperimaginaries. Before we state the above dichotomy for the special case of the τ^f-topologies (simplified version), let us recall the basic definitions.

Definition 4.7 A type $p \in S(A)$ is said to be *essentially 1-based by mean of the τ^f-topologies* if for every finite tuple $\bar{c}$ from p and for every type-definable τ^f-open set $\mathcal{U}$ over $A\bar{c}$, the set $\{a \in \mathcal{U} | \ Cb(a/A\bar{c}) \notin bdd(aA)\}$ is nowhere dense in the Stone-topology of $\mathcal{U}$.

Fact 4.8 *Let T be a countable simple theory with PCFT that eliminates hyperimaginaries. Let p_0 be a partial type over $\emptyset$ of SU-rank 1. Then, either there exists an unbounded finite-SU-rank τ^f-open set over some countable set, or every type $p \in S(A)$, with A countable, that is internal in p_0 is essentially 1-based by mean of the τ^f-topologies.*

By Corollary 4.5 we conclude:

Corollary 4.9 *Let T be a countable theory with wnfcp that eliminates hyperimaginaries. Let p_0 be a partial type over $\emptyset$ of SU-rank 1. Then, either there exists a SU-rank 1 definable set, or every type $p \in S(A)$, with A countable, that is internal in p_0 is essentially 1-based by mean of the τ^f-topologies.*

References

[BPV] I.Ben-Yaacov, A.Pillay, E.Vassiliev, Lovely pairs of models, Annals of Pure and Applied Logic 122 (2003), no. 1-3.

[H0] E.Hrushovski, Countable unidimensional stable theories are superstable, unpublished paper.

[P] A.Pillay, On countable simple unidimensional theories, Journal of Symbolic Logic 68 (2003), no. 4.

[S0] Z.Shami, On analyzability in the forking topology for simple theories, Annals of Pure Applied Logic 142 (2006), no. 1-3, 115–124.

[S1] Z.Shami, Countable imaginary simple unidimensional theories, preprint.